(SRI M. S. KRISHNAN)

My humble suggestion is that the ruling may kindly be reconsidered and an opportunity given to the hon. Member although I cannot question your ruling.

SRI S. BANGARAPPA.—If you can bear with me for one minute. ಸ್ವಾಮಿ, ಶ್ರೀ ವಿ. ಎನ್. ಪಾಟೀಲರ ಪ್ರಶ್ನೆಗೆ ಮಾನ್ಯ ಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳೇ ಕಾಲ ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಂಡದ್ದರಿಂದ ತಾವು ನಾಳೆ ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಳ್ಳುತ್ತೇನೆ ಎಂದು ಹೇಳಿದ್ದಿರಿ. ಆದ್ದರಿಂದ ಮಾನ್ಯ ಸದಸ್ಯರು ಈ ದಿನ ಆ ಪ್ರಶ್ನೆ ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಳ್ಳಬಹುದೆಂದು ಕಾದು ಕುಳಿತಿದ್ದರು. ಈಗ ತಾವು ಸಮಯವಿಲ್ಲವೆಂದು ಆ ಪ್ರಶ್ನೆಯನ್ನು ರ್ಯಾಪ್ಸ್ ಆಯಿತು ಎಂದು ಹೇಳಿ ರೂಲಿಂಗ್ ಕೊಟ್ಟಿರಿ. ತಾವು ಕೊಟ್ಟ ರೂಲಿಂಗನ್ನು ನಾವುಗಳು ಒಪ್ಪಿಕೊಂಡುಬಿಡುತ್ತೇವೆ. ಆದರೆ ತಾವು ರೂಲಿಂಗ್ ಕೊಡುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಮುಂಚೆ ಯೋಚನೆ ಮಾಡಿ ರೂಲಿಂಗ್ ಕೊಡುವುದು ಒಳ್ಳೆಯದು. ಶ್ರೀ ಪಾಟೀಲರಿಗೆ ನಾಳೆ ತಮ್ಮ ಪ್ರಶ್ನೆಯನ್ನು ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಳ್ಳುತ್ತೇನೆ ಎಂದು ಹೇಳಿದ ಮೇಲೆ ಅವರಿಗೆ ಮತ್ತೆ ಅವಕಾಶ ಮಾಡಿ ಕೊಡುವುದು ಒಳ್ಳೆಯದೆಂದು ನನ್ನ ಭಾವನೆ. ತಾವು ಈಗ ಕೊಟ್ಟ ತಮ್ಮ ರೂಲಿಂಗನ್ನು ಮತ್ತೆ ಪುನರ್ವಿಮರ್ಶೆ ಮಾಡುವುದು ಒಳ್ಳೆಯದೆಂದು ನನ್ನ ಭಾವನೆ.

MR. SPEAKER.—Nothing is added by the hon. Members who spoke just now and from what was said by Mr. Krishnan, I think the Chair's ruling was not properly appreciated. When a number of questions are put down for oral answers as starred questions for want of time, some questions are not answered. Some questions do remain and they go on record as unstarred questions in the sense that the questions and replies furnished will be printed in the proceedings of the House for that day. I never attempted to convert a starred question into unstarred question. It is only a matter of procedure that questions not actually taken up on any particular day will be printed along with answers in the day's proceedings. I said nothing more than that. Now there are 20 questions put down. I want to raise that number to 30 if the hon. Members co-operate. But with the best of co-operation available, if some questions cannot be taken up on the floor of the House for want of time, such questions and answers will be printed in the day's proceedings. The held over question of Sri V. N. Patil will be treated in the same manner. It should have been answered along with other questions. It was unfortunate that it was not reached. It does not mean that I am attempting to shield the Government and I am deliberately denying the opportunity to the Member. The hon. Member should be fair to the Chair.

With this, I think all this controversy is set at rest. I will take up the next item.

SRI S. BANGARAPPA —I am afraid we are creating a very bad precedent.

Motion of No-Confidence in the Council of Ministers—Grant of leave to move.

MR. SPEAKER.—Yesterday three hon. Members, Sri H. M. Channabasappa and others have given notice of a no-confidence motion.

I shall take up the other motions later. I shall now call upon any one of the hon. Members who have given notice of the no-confidence motion, to ask for leave of the House to move the motion.

SRI S. SIVAPPA (Sravanabelagola).—I seek the leave of this House to move the motion of no-confidence against the Council of Ministers.

MR. SPEAKER.—The question is: I request hon. Members who are in favour of leave being granted to the motion to rise in their seats.

AN HON. MEMBER.—Two members on the Congress side are standing.

(Counting was taken)

MR. SPEAKER.—I am not concerned with it. Since more than 30 members have stood up, leave is granted to the hon. Member Sri Sivappa to move his motion.

I allot Tuesday for the consideration of this motion. So it will be taken up on Tuesday.

Notice of adjournment Motion *re*: Hunger Strike in Gadag Town.

SRI K. H. PATIL.—I have given notice under Rule 50. Yesterday it was not received in the hands of the Secretary, well in time. Today I would like to impress upon the Chair and request that consent may be given to me to move the adjournment motion because it is very serious matter wherein the Municipal Administrator.....

1.30 P.M.

MR. SPEAKER.—The hon. Member Sri K. H. Patil has given notice of an adjournment motion. I have not made up my mind whether to give consent or not to give consent. Before considering the question of consent, I would request Sri Patil to explain why permission should be given to him to make the motion. While doing so, he should not go into the merits of the motion. I want him to enlighten me only on the following three aspects and nothing more:

Firstly, whether the question of hunger-strike can be an occasion for moving an adjournment motion. Secondly, from the wording of his notice, it appears that there are certain justiciable rights; certain parties are claiming rights in a particular place and others are asserting their right of public way. Sri Patil should tell the House whether the House could be a forum for considering this matter when it falls within the jurisdiction of the civil courts and when it relates to civil rights. Thirdly, when the House is debating the Governor's Address, whether it is not open to the Member to raise this point also during the course of his speech.